

1
2
3
4 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
5 DISTRICT OF NEVADA

6 * * *

7 STEVEN ROBERT EVANS GOD,

8 Plaintiff,

9 v.

10 STEVEN R. EVANS GOD.,

11 Defendants.
12
13

Case No. 2:25-cv-00025-RFB-BNW

ORDER

14 Before the Court for consideration is the Report and Recommendation (ECF No. 6) of the
15 Honorable Brenda Weksler, United States Magistrate Judge, entered on January 8, 2025. A district
16 court “may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the findings or recommendations made
17 by the magistrate.” 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). A party may file specific written objections to the
18 findings and recommendations of a magistrate judge. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); Local Rule IB 3-2(a).
19 When written objections have been filed, the district court is required to “make a *de novo*
20 determination of those portions of the report or specified proposed findings or recommendations
21 to which objection is made.” 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); see also Local Rule IB 3-2(b). Where a party
22 fails to object, however, a district court is not required to conduct “any review,” *de novo* or
23 otherwise, of the report and recommendations of a magistrate judge. Thomas v. Arn, 474 U.S. 140,
24 149 (1985). Pursuant to Local Rule IB 3-2(a), objections were due by January 22, 2025. No
25 objections have been filed. The Court has reviewed the record in this case and concurs with the
26 Magistrate Judge’s recommendation.

27 ///

28 ///

IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that the Report and Recommendation (ECF No. 6) is **ACCEPTED** and **ADOPTED** in full.

DATED: May 20, 2025.